VIII.

THE CASE OF KNEELING AT THE Holy Sacrament STATED & RESOLVED.

PART II.

Wherein these QUERIES are considered.

IV. Whether Kneeling commanded in the Church of *England* be not contrary to the general Practice of the Church of Christ in the first and purest Ages?

V. Whether it be unlawful for us to Receive Kneeling, because this Gesture was first introduced by Idolaters, and is still notoriously abused by the Papists to Idolatrous ends and purposes.

LONDON:

Printed for *T. Basset*, at the *George* in *Fleet-street*; *B. Took*, at the *Ship* in St. *Pauls Church-yard*; and *F. Gardiner*, at the *White Horse* in *Ludgate-street*. 1683.

BIBLIOTHECA RODERIANA

BOOKS Printed for *FINCHAM GARDINER.*

A Continuation and Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, in Anſwer to Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Lob*, &c.

Conſiderations of preſent uſe, conſidering the Danger reſulting from the change of our Church-Government.

1. A Perſwaſive to Communion with the Church of *England.*

2. A Reſolution of ſome Caſes of Conſcience which reſpect Church-Communion.

3. The Caſe of Indifferent things uſed in the Worſhip of God, propoſed and Stated, by conſidering theſe Queſtions, &c.

4. A Diſcourſe about Edification.

5. The Reſolution of this Caſe of Conſcience, *Whether the Church of* Englands *Symbolizing ſo far as it doth with the Church of* Rome, *makes it unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of* England?

6. A Letter to *Anonymus*, in anſwer to his three Letters to Dr. *Sherlock* about Church-Communion.

7. Certain Caſes of Conſcience reſolved, concerning the Lawfulneſs of joyning with Forms of Prayer in Publick Worſhip. In two Parts.

8. The Caſe of mixt Communion: Whether it be Lawful to Separate from a Church upon the account of promiſcuous Congregations and mixt Communions?

9. An Anſwer to the Diſſenters Objections againſt the Common Prayers, and ſome other parts of Divine Service preſcribed in the Liturgy of the Church of *England.*

10. The Caſe of Kneeling at the Holy Sacrament ſtated and reſolved, &c. The firſt Part.

11. Certain Caſes of Conſcience, &c. The ſecond Part.

12. A Diſcourſe of Profiting by Sermons, and of going to hear where men think they can profit moſt.

13. A ſerious Exhortation, with ſome important Advices, relating to the late Caſes about Conformity, recommended to the preſent Diſſenters from the Church of *England.*

14. An Argument for Union; taken from the true intereſt of thoſe Diſſenters in *England* who profeſs and call themſelves Proteſtants.

1. A Diſcourſe about the charge of Novelty upon the Reformed Church of *England,* made by the Papiſts asking of us the Queſtion, Where was our Religion before *Luther?*

2. A Diſcourſe about Tradition, ſhewing what is meant by it, and what Tradition is to be received, and what Tradition is to be rejected.

3. The difference of the Caſe between the Separation of Proteſtants from the Church of *Rome,* and the Separation of Diſſenters from the Church of *England.*

ERRATA.

Part I.

Pag. 41. marg. for St. *Chryſ.* jero. Catech. read St. *Cyril,* jero. Catech.

Part II.

Pag. 13. marg. before *An. D.* put *Floruit.* p. 34. lin. 32. for *Claderwood* r. *Calderwood.*

Query

Query IV.

Whether Kneeling, commanded in the Church of England, *be not contrary to the general Practice of the Church of Christ in the first and purest Ages?*

THE onely way for any man to give or receive satisfaction in this point, is diligently to consult the Records of ancient Times, and from them make a faithful report of the Customs and Usages of the ancient Catholick Church: For when once these are made manifest, it will be very easie, by comparing things together, to discern whether they are consistent, or contrary one to another: Whether the Practice of the Church of *England* (as to Kneeling at the Sacrament) be agreeable or repugnant to that of the Primitive Christians. In Answer therefore to this Question, my business is to give a plain Historical Account of the practice of the Church in those early Ages of Christianity; from whence it may evidently appear, that the Church of *England*, by obliging her Communicants to Kneel, doth not oblige them to practise any thing but what is agreeable to the Customs and Practice of pure Antiquity. And this I will endeavour to do, under these Two general Heads.

(1.) It's highly probable that the Primitive Church uſed to Kneel in the act of receiving the Holy Sacrament, as our Cuſtom at preſent is.

(2.) It's moſt certain they uſed an Adoring Poſture.

But before I enter upon this undertaking, I will crave leave to premiſe ſomewhat concerning this Query in general, and ſomewhat for explication of a Term contained in it, *viz.* What we are to underſtand by *The Firſt and pureſt Ages.*

As to the Caſe it ſelf in general, it is of ſuch a nature, and requires ſuch an Anſwer, that not one among Twenty thouſand of the ordinary and common ſort of people is duly qualified to underſtand it, and paſs a true judgement upon it: the merits of the Cauſe are quite out of their reach; and whether we are in the right or the wrong they know not, but believe as they are taught, and upon the credit of others who they ſuppoſe are able to inform them about ſuch matters. For in order to eſtimate the preſent Caſe aright and as it ought, it is neceſſary that a man have ſome competent knowledge of and inſight into the Cuſtoms and Conſtitutions of the ancient Church, the Decrees of Councils, the Works of the Fathers, and the Original Languages wherein they wrote; which, I am ſure, few or none of the Vulgar have attained to.

And truly upon this very conſideration I ſhould have paſs'd this Query by without taking the leaſt notice of it, had I not in my converſe with ſeveral Diſſenting Laymen, heard it ſtarted and pleaded in juſtification of their Nonconformity to the Cuſtom and Conſtitution of the Church of *England.*

I confeſs, I did a little wonder to find men make that a Rule of Conſcience, (and boldly relie and practiſe upon it)which they do not at all underſtand;to find this Weapon put into the hands of ordinary and illiterate perſons, not onely to defend themſelves againſt the Commands of their lawful Superiours, and thoſe who are ſet over them by God to be their Rulers and Guides, (in all ſuch caſes eſpecially where they are not able to guide and direct themſelves) but alſo to wound and murder the Reputation of the National Church, as degenerate from all Antiquity, as introducing and impoſing novel Cuſtoms and Ceremonies repugnant to the Principles and Practices of the firſt and pureſt Ages.

Whether it be well done in Nonconforming Miniſters to furniſh the common people with ſuch kind of Arguments as theſe, ſo much out of their way, and above their pitch and capacity, I leave the honeſt part of the world to judge.

The (2) thing I would premiſe is this: Suppoſing Kneeling at the Sacrament was never uſed by the ancient Church, yet ſuch an Objection is a wretched Plea in the mouth of a Diſſenter to juſtifie his Nonconformity by as to this particular Geſture.

For if Kneeling be a crime and unlawful becauſe it was not uſed in Primitive Times, Sitting at the Sacrament is a much greater; for that was condemned as an irreverend Poſture, as will appear by and by. Beſides, they themſelves have a very little value for Antiquity, and in all things almoſt run counter to it.

And one would think that they ſhould be very willing to receive Kneeling, for that very reaſon which they produce againſt it; that is, becauſe it is contrary to the currant practice of all Antiquity, as they would

make their Party to believe. This might be expected from them, because they will not be perswaded by any means or entreaties to comply with such Customs and Ceremonies of our Church as were undoubtedly used by the ancient Christians: (such as *God-fathers and God-mothers*, *the Cross in Baptism*, *the Ring in Marriage*, the Feasts or Holy-days of *Christmas*, *Easter*, &c.) but instead of Conformity to these things, they raise an Hue and Cry upon the Church as Popish and Antichristian for enjoyning such Ceremonies, and pretend they had much rather endure any extremity, than submit their Necks to such an intolerable Yoak. But how hard is the Government put to it to please such humorsome persons! When our Governours tread in the very steps of the Primitive Bishops and blessed Martyrs, then they are Popish and Antichristian, and the Consciences of our Dissenting Brethren will not suffer them to Conform; and at other times they cannot Conform, because they require them to do what was never required nor practised in the Church of Christ throughout all preceding Generations, till Transubstantiation was established in the World. So that to follow Antiquity is a great Objection against Conformity at sometimes, and not to follow it as great at others: When ever they please to make it so, it is so, say or do what one can to the contrary. Thus much concerning the Case in general: Let us now see the meaning of that Phrase, *The first and purest Ages*.

This I think may be easily made out, from the Writings of those men who have stoutly defended sitting, or a Common Table-Gesture; who have delivered their minds with as much clearness, and as roundly as one would wish, concerning this matter. For thus the Author of a Book formerly cited affirms, *That Antiquity*

is wholly againſt us, and the Primitive Churches never ſo much as heard of Kneeling, and the Churches ſucceeding excluded it out of their Congregations, and gave it no Entertainment for the ſpace of 1200 *years. That Kneeling to receive the Sacrament, was not uſed at the Inſtitution of the Lords Supper, nor after in any Age of the Church, before the time of* Honorius *the Third, about the year* 1220. So alſo another great Champion for ſitting writes. *Didoclavius maintaineth* (ſaith he) *that which none of our oppoſites are able to infringe*, viz. *That no Teſtimony can be produced which may evince that ever Kneeling was uſed before the time of* Honorius *the Third.* He further obſerves from the Hiſtory of the *Waldenſes, That bowing of the Knees before the Hoſt was then only enjoyned, when the opinion of Tranſubſtantiation got place.* By the Practice of the Church in the firſt and pureſt Ages, I conceive they mean thus much: *That from the Age wherein the Holy Apoſtles lived, down to that wherein Tranſubſtantiation was ſet on foot, or that wherein* Honorius *the Third enjoined the Adoration of the Hoſt, kneeling in the Act of Receiving the Lords Supper was never heard of nor uſed; or as one Author expreſly aſſerts it, till the year* 1220. Howſoever, for ſureneſs ſake, and in order to the clearing of this matter under our preſent Conſideration, I think it will be requiſite to fix the time wherein Tranſubſtantiation was firſt broacht, as well as when it was eſtabliſht, or impoſed as an Article of Faith; and ſo too wherein the Adoration of the Hoſt was enjoyned: whereby the juſt bounds and limits will be known, beyond which we are not to paſs to fetch in Evidence; and conſequently all Extravagancy will be prevented on our part, and all Cavilling (if poſſible) on theirs.

Diſpute upon Queſt. of Kneel. &c. to the Reader.

id. p. 67.

Gilleſp. Diſp. againſt Eng. Pop. Cer. p. 191. Altar. Damaſce. 784.

lib. 1. c. 1.

As for the Time then, which we enquire after, I think

think we may ſafely rely on the judgment of a very Learned Prelate of our own, which he delivers after this manner. The word *Tranſubſtantiation* is ſo far from being found in the Sacred Scriptures, or the Writings of the Ancient Fathers, that the great Patrons of it do themſelves acknowledge, it was not ſo much as heard of before the twelfth Century. Nay, that the *Thing it ſelf* without the *Word*, that the *Doctrine* without the *Expreſſion* cannot be proved from Scripture, is ingenuouſly acknowledged by the moſt Learned Schoolmen, who endeavour by other Arguments therefore to defend it, and allow it to be brought in by the Authority of the Pope, and not received in the Church of *Rome* till 1200 years after Chriſt. The firſt Authors who mention this new-coyn'd word *Tranſubſtantiation*, are *Petrus Bleſenſis*, who lived under Pope *Alexander* the Third, (about the year 1159) and *Stephanus Eduenſis*, a Biſhop whoſe Age and Writings are very doubtful. The Pope who firſt eſtabliſht this monſtrous Doctrine by his own Arbitrary power, as an Article of Faith, was *Innoccent* the Third. And his Succeſſor *Honorius* was the man who decreed *Adoration* to the *Hoſt*. The *firſt Council* which took notice and approved of the Papal Decree for Tranſubſtantiation, was that aſſembled at *Conſtance*, which condemned *Wiclif* for an Heretick, becauſe among other truths he had aſſerted this; *That the Subſtance of the Bread and Wine remains materially in the Sacrament of the Altar; and that in the ſame Sacrament no accidents of Bread and Wine remain without a Subſtance:* and for this Opinion they ordered his Body to be taken out of his Grave, and burnt to aſhes. Thus things ſtood till the year 1551. when the *Council of Trent* publiſht it to the world for an Infallible Truth, and impoſed the belief of it upon all, under the pain of an *Anathema*. As

Hiſtori. Tranſub. Papal. *Johan. Ep. Duneln.* Edit. 1675. p. 53, 54.

Scotus, Durandus, Biel, Cameracen, Cajetan, &c.

An. Dom. 1215.

An. Dom. 1217, or thereabouts.

A. D. 1415.

As for the Doctrine of *Conſubſtantiation*, and the Corporal preſence of Chriſt at, with, and in the Sacrament, it was ſtarted long before that of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and was much diſputed among learned men. He who firſt broacht it in the Eaſt, was *John Damaſcen*, in the days of *Gregory the Third*. And about an hundred years afterwards it was ſet a-foot in the Weſt by the means of *Paſchaſius Radbertus* a Monk of *Corbie*, and one *Amalarius* a Deacon of *Metz*. The former taught that Chriſt was Conſubſtantiated, or rather encloſed in the Bread, and Corporally united to it in the Sacrament; for as yet there was no thoughts of the Tranſubſtantiation of Bread. The latter gives it as part of his belief, *that the ſimple nature of the Bread and Wine mixed, is turned into a reaſonable nature*, viz. of the Body and Blood of Chriſt. Moreover, he in another place confeſſeth, that it was paſt his skill to determine what became of this body after it was eaten. *When the Body of Chriſt is taken with a good intention, it is not for me to diſpute* (ſaith he) *whether it be inviſibly taken up into Heaven, or kept in our Body until the day of our burial, or exhaled into the Air, or whether it go out of the Body with the Blood, or be ſent out by the mouth*, &c. For this, and another Foolery of the three parts or kinds of Chriſts Body, he was cenſured by a Synod held at *Creſſy*, wherein it was declared by the Biſhops of *France*, That the Bread and Wine are ſpiritually made the Body of Chriſt; which being a meat of the Mind, and not of the Belly, is not corrupted, but remaineth unto everlaſting life. From whence we may learn (as alſo from the writings of ſeveral Learned men of that Age who oppoſed theſe Dotages of the Corporal preſence) that the Weſtern Church had not then adulterated the Doctrine of the Sacra-

About the year 740.

Who wrote de Eccleſiaſ. Offiiciis de ord. Antiphon, *&c.* cotemporary with *Amalarius Fortunatus* Ar. Bp. of *Triers*, who wrote de Sac. Baptiſ. ad *Carol.* M.

Amalar. de Eccleſi. Offic. lib. 3. c. 24. vid. lib. 3. c. 35.

Amalar. Epiſt. ad *Guitardum* MS in Biblioth. Coll. S. Benedic. Cantabri. Cod. 55. cited by A. Bp. *Uſher*, Anſ. Jeſuits Chall. p. 75.

Rabanus Maurus, *John Eyigena* Wala. *Strabo*, *Ratramus* or *Bertramus*.

Sacrament, but followed the pure and found ſenſe of the Ancient Fathers, and condemned theſe whimſeys and groſs conceits of the carnal or Oral eating of Chriſt in the Sacrament. Nay in the year 1079. when *Hildebrand* called *Gregory* the 7th came to the Papal Chair, the Biſhops and Doctors were divided in their opinions concerning the Corporal Preſence; ſome maintaining *Berengarius* his opinion who denied it, and ſome following that of *Paſchaſius*, as appears from the Acts of that Council (writ by thoſe of the Popes Faction) which was called on purpoſe to condemn *Berengarius*. Moreover, it's recorded that *Hildebrand* himſelf doubted whether what we receive at the Lords Table be indeed the Body of Chriſt by a ſubſtantial Converſion. For three months ſpace was granted to *Berengarius* to conſider in; and a Faſt appointed to the Cardinals, That God would ſhew by ſome ſign from Heaven who was in the right, the *Pope* or *Berengarius*. It ſeems the Doctrine of the Popes Infallibility was not known to that Age; and that of the Corporal preſence much doubted. But however, thus much we may conclude upon, That from the dark and myſterious Writings of thoſe men, *Paſchaſius* and *Amalarius*, did that monſtrous errour of Tranſubſtantiation ſpring, which afterwards came to be eſtabliſh'd as an Article of Faith in the Church of *Rome*.

Benno Card. in vita *Hild.* Epiſ. Dunelm. Hiſt. Tranſ. p. 135.

As to the time then wherein we are to contain this Diſcourſe, it ſhall be the firſt 700 years after Chriſt; and to Authors only that liv'd within that compaſs, I will appeal for evidence in the matter under diſpute: and ſurely our Diſſenting Brethren will allow that they lived in the firſt and pureſt Ages, becauſe they were dead before the Doctrines either of *Conſubſtantiation* or *Tranſubſtantiation* were hatcht, much leſs received or eſtabliſht in the World.

If

If I would take all the advantage that our Adverſaries give us, I need not confine my ſelf within ſo narrow a compaſs. For they challenge us to produce one inſtance for Kneeling before the days of *Honorius* the Third, who lived 1220 or thereabouts; and confidently affirm Kneeling was never heard of nor uſed for 1200 years after Chriſt. I hope therefore they will not complain of foul dealing, or that I ſtrain the point, ſince I give away 500 years, wherein the pure ancient Catholick Faith touching the Holy Sacrament began to decline, and was by various arts and tricks at laſt foully corrupted. Which piece of liberality I need not have exerciſed, but that I deſign purely to convince, not to contend. Let us therefore bring this matter under examination, and ſee what the practice of the Church was within the compaſs of 700 years after Chriſt; or, which is all one, in the firſt and pureſt Ages. And what I ſhall produce out of Antiquity, may be conveniently placed under theſe two general Heads, according to the method propoſed in the beginning of this Diſcourſe.

(1.) That notwithſtanding ſeveral Nonconformiſts, well eſteemed of for Learning, have in their Writings boldly aſſerted Kneeling to be contrary to all Antiquity; it is highly probable the Primitive Chriſtians did Kneel in the act of Receiving, as the Cuſtom is in the Church of *England*.

(2) It's certain they uſed an Adoring poſture.

As to the firſt, I hope I ſhall be able to make it good by this following Account which I ſhall give with all poſſible plainneſs and ſincerity. And I declare beforehand to all the World, that I will offer nothing for ſa-

tisfaction to others, which I do not think in my Conſcience to be true; and that I would not uſe a Fallacy to ſerve the Cauſe, though I were ſure it could never be detected by any of our Separating brethren. In the firſt place, for the firſt Century or 100 years wherein our Lord and his Apoſtles lived, the Scripture hath left us in the dark, and under great uncertainty what the particular geſture was which they uſed at the Inſtitution and Celebration of the Holy Sacrament; which I think I have ſufficiently evinced in my Anſwers to the firſt and ſecond Query.

Part. 1. p. 17.

In the next place, I deſire thoſe who urge a common Table-geſture, and particularly Sitting (which was a uſual poſture at meals among thoſe Eaſtern Nations as well as among us now) to obſerve, that Sitting was eſteemed a very irreverent Poſture to be uſed in the Worſhip and Service of God by the Primitive Church; of which I ſhall give a few inſtances. The ancient *Laodicean* Synod finding great inconveniencies to ariſe from the Love-Feaſts which were kept at the ſame time with the Lords Supper, prohibited abſolutely the ſaid Feaſts, and the lying upon Couches in the Church; as their manner was of Solemnizing thoſe Feaſts. The words of the Canon are theſe: *The Feaſts of Charity ought not to be kept in the Lords Houſe or in the Church, neither may ye eat or make Couches in the Houſe of God.* This was afterward forbidden by the *Council* of *Carthage*; and the Decrees of both theſe Provincial or National Councils were ratified by the 6th *Trullan Council*, and that under the pain of Excommunication: upon which in ſome time the Cuſtom dwindled to nothing.

Which met under Pope *Sylveſter*, 1. between the *Neocæſarian* Synod and the firſt general Council of *Nice*; that is, between the years 314 and 325, as ſome learned men think; or *Anno Dom.* 365. after the firſt general *Nicene* Council, as others.

Can. 28.

Can. 74.

Now

Now the Reaſons which induced theſe Holy Biſhops and ancient Fathers to prohibit theſe Feaſts of Charity, and the uſe of a diſcumbing poſture upon Beds or Couches in the Houſe of God, (which was too, an ordinary Table-geſture, according to the Cuſtome of thoſe Times) were in all probability taken from the diſorder and irreverence, the animoſities and exceſs that accompanied theſe Feaſts, and which both poor and rich were guilty of: They did not diſtinguiſh between their ſpiritual and corporal food, between the Lords Supper and an ordinary Meal; they did not *diſcern the Lords Body*, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks: and I am apt to think that the ſame abuſes which had crept in ſo early into the Church of *Corinth*, and which St. *Paul* took notice of and reproved, continued and ſpread till the Church by her Cenſures and Decrees oppoſed the growing evil, and rooted up the cauſes of ſuch miſchievous effects.

To theſe Canons of Councils if we adde the Teſtimony of particular Biſhops, who lived in thoſe firſt Ages, and who ſpeak not their own private ſenſe and opinions, but the Cuſtomes and Uſages of the Church in their time; we ſhall plainly diſcern that Sitting was accounted an irreverent poſture in the Worſhip of God, while they were engaged in Prayer or Praiſe, or receiving the Holy Sacrament.

Juſtin Martyr, who lived in the ſecond Century, which immediately ſucceeded that of the Apoſtles, ſeems to hint that the people ſat at the Sermon, and while the Leſſons were reading, when he informs us concerning the Chriſtian Aſſemblies in his time, and the place where he lived: After the reading of the Leſſons and the exhortatory Sermon of the Biſhop, *we riſe up* (ſaith he) *all together, and ſend up our prayers.* He

Flor. Anu. D. 155.

Apol. 2.

doth not indeed ſignifie what the particular Geſture was which they uſed at their Prayers, but it's clear enough that they did not Sit; and they might Kneel, for any thing he ſaith to the contrary. For it's cuſtomary among us to ſit at the Sermon, and during the reading of the Leſſons; and after they are ended, we may be truly ſaid to riſe up all together, and ſend up our Prayers: But if any one ſhould hence infer that we ſtood and not kneeled, he would conclude againſt the Law of the Land, and the common practice of the Church: Riſing up doth not neceſſarily imply that a man ſtands or kneels afterwards, but ſomewhat previous to both; for we generally riſe before we do either. But however ſitting at the Sermon and Leſſons was uſual in thoſe Aſſemblies which this holy Father and Martyr frequented; yet in moſt other places the people were not permitted to ſit at all, not ſo much as at the Leſſons, or in Sermon-time; as appears partly from what *Philoſtorgius* an ancient Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian obſerves of *Theophilus* an *Indian* Biſhop; That among ſeveral irregularities which he corrected in thoſe Churches, he particularly reformed this, *that the people were wont to ſit when the Leſſons out of the Goſpel were read unto them*: And partly from *Sozomens* Hiſtory, wherein he notes it as a very unuſual thing in the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, *that he did not riſe up when the Goſpels were read.*

Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 3. n. 5. p. 29. Flor. A.D. 425.

But the fulleſt evidence *Optatus* Biſhop of *Milevis* affords us, by what he writes againſt *Parmenianus* the *Donatiſt*. For after he had taxed him with Pride and Innovation, with a cenſorious uncharitable ſpirit which animated all his Tractates or Sermons to the people, he cites a paſſage out of the *Pſalms*, and applies it home to him, after this manner: *Thou ſitteſt and ſpeakeſt againſt*

Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 7. c. 19. p. 734 Flor. A.D. 440.

againſt thy Brother, &c. in which place God reproves him who ſits and defames his Brother: and therefore ſuch evil-*Teachers* as you (ſays he) are more particularly pointed at in this Text; *For the people are not licenſed to ſit in the Church.* This Text chiefly reſpects the Biſhops and Presbyters, who had only a right and priviledge to ſit in the publick and religious Aſſemblies; but doth not concern the people, who ſtood all the time. Now if it had not been a general and prevailing cuſtom among the Chriſtians of thoſe times, as well Heretical as Orthodox, to ſtand the whole time of Divine Service, and particularly at the Leſſons and Sermons, *Parmenianus* might have eaſily retorted this Argument upon *Optatus*, as being weak, and concluding nothing againſt him in particular, but what might be charged in common upon all private Chriſtians who ſate in the Church as well as he.

Pſal. 49. in our Tranſl. 50. 20. Lib. 4. de Schiſm. Donat. p. 78. Par. Edit. An. D. 365. Vid. *Albaſp.* not. in 4 lib. *Optat.*

Again, that Sitting was eſteemed irreverent in the Worſhip of God, will further be manifeſted from a paſſage or two in *Tertullian*, who lived in the ſame Century with *Juſtin Martyr* before cited: and I think nothing can be ſpoken more plain and home to the purpoſe than what he delivers concerning this geſture which is ſo much contended for by our Diſſenting Brethren. For among other vanities and ill cuſtoms taken notice of and reproved by this ancient Father, this was one, That they were wont (ſome of them) to ſit at Prayer. A little further in the ſame Chapter, *Tertullian* hath theſe words: *Adde hereunto the ſin of Irreverence, which the very Heathen if they did perceive well and underſtand what*

Ann. Dom. 198. *Tertul.* de Orat. c. 12. Tom. 2. p. 130. edit. Collon. Agrip. 1617. item quod adſignatâ oratione aſſidendi moſ. eſt quibuſdam, &c.

Tertull. de Oratione, c. 12.

Eo apponitur & irreverentiæ crimen, etiam ipſis nationibus ſi quid ſaperent intelligendum. Si quidem irreverens eſt aſſidere ſub conſpectu contraque conſpectum ejus quem cum maxime revereris ac venereris; quanto magis ſub conſpectu Dei vivi, Angelo adhuc orationis adſtante, factum illud irreligioſiſſimum eſt? niſi exprobramus Deo quod nos oratio fatigaverit.

we

we did, would take notice of. For if it be irreverent to ſit in the preſence of, and to confront one whom you have a high reſpect and veneration for, How much more irreligious is this geſture in the ſight of the living God, the Angel of Prayer yet ſtanding by! unleſs we think fit to upbraid God that Prayer hath tired us. Adde to all this that ſaying of *Conſtantine* the Great, recorded by *Euſebius* as an indication of the Piety of that Chriſtian Emperour, with which I will conclude this point. It was upon occaſion of a *Panegyrick* concerning the Sepulchre of our Saviour, delivered by *Euſebius*, not in the *Church*, but in the *Palace* of the Emperour; and the Hiſtorian obſerves, to the praiſe of this excellent Prince, that though it was a long and tedious Oration, and though the Emperour was earneſtly ſollicited to ſit down on his Throne which was hard by, yet he refuſed, and ſtood attentively all the time, as the reſt of the Auditory did; affirming it to be *unfit to attend upon any Diſcourſe concerning God with eaſe and ſoftneſs; and that it was very conſonant to Piety and Religion, that Diſcourſes about divine things ſhould be heard ſtanding.*

Euſeb. de vit. *Conſt. Mag.* lib. 4. p. 400. Col. Allob. 1612.

Thus much may ſuffice for ſatisfaction, that the ancient Church did by no means approve of Sitting, or a common Table-geſture, as fitting to be uſed in time of Divine Service, except at the reading of the Leſſons and hearing of the Sermon; which too was onely practiſed in ſome places, for in others the people were not allowed to ſit at all in their religious Aſſemblies. Which Cuſtom is ſtill obſerved in moſt, if not all the Eaſtern Churches at this day, wherein there are no ſeats erected or allowed for the uſe of the people.

Now upon what hath been ſaid, I ſhall onely make this brief Reflexion, and ſo proceed. If the Apoſtles of our Lord had (in purſuance of their Commiſſion

to

to teach all Nations) in their Travels throughout the World, every where taught and eſtabliſhed ſitting or diſcumbing, (which were the common Table-geſtures according to the Cuſtoms of thoſe Eaſtern Countries) not onely as convenient, but as neceſſary to be uſed in order to worthy receiving the Lords Supper; it is a moſt ſtrange and unacountable thing how there ſhould be (1) Such an early and univerſal revolt of the Primitive Church from the Doctrine and the Conſtitutions of the Holy Apoſtles; and then (2) Conſidering what a high value and eſteem the Primitive Chriſtians had for the Apoſtles, the firſt founders of their Faith, and for all that paſſed under their names, it ſeems to me not onely highly improbable, but morally impoſſible that ſo many Churches, together with their reſpective Biſhops and Paſtors dwelling in remote and diſtant Countries, (not biaſs'd by Faction, nor ſwayed by a ſuperiour Authority, being perfectly free and independent one upon another) ſhould unanimouſly conſent and conſpire together to introduce a novel Cuſtom into the Church of Chriſt, contrary to Apoſtolical Practice and Order; and not onely ſo, but (3) to Cenſure the practice and injunctions of divinely-inſpired men, as indecent and unfit to be followed and obſerved in the publick Worſhip of God: and all this without the leaſt notice taken by, without any complaint or oppoſition from any particular perſon either in the then preſent or the ſucceeding generation.

(3.) The Primitive Church eſteemed the Holy Sacrament to be the moſt ſolemn part of Chriſtian Worſhip, as that which deſervedly challenged from them the utmoſt pitch of Devotion, and the higheſt degree of Reverence that they could poſſibly pay and expreſs either

either with their Souls or Bodies. This is clear, partly from those Honorary Titles they bestowed upon this Ordinance and adorn'd it with, which import the greatest deference and the most awful regard imaginable; partly from that tedious and severe Discipline which she exercised the Catechumens and Penitents with, before she admitted them into the Communion of the Faithful, and approved of them as fit to partake of the Holy Mysteries. To be admitted to the Sacrament so onely as to behold it, and to be present at those Prayers which were put up by worthy Communicants over the great Propitiatory Sacrifice, was heretofore accounted a high honour and priviledge: But to make one at this heavenly Feast, and to receive the pledges of our Lords love, was esteemed the top and perfection of Christianity, and the extremity of honour and happiness that a Christian is capable of in this life. Heretofore (with shame and reproach be it spoken to our stupidly wicked and degenerate Age) to be excluded from the Holy Communion was look'd upon as the greatest curse and punishment that could be inflicted; and on the other hand, to be a Communicant, to have a freedom of access to the Lords Table, as the greatest blessing and most ample reward that could be propounded; the sum of a Christians hopes, the center of all his wishes during his abode here.

See part 1. p. 58.

(4.) For standing in time of Divine Service, both at their Prayers and at the Sacrament, there are so many and so clear testimonies extant in pure Antiquity, that a man must take a great deal of pains not to see this truth, who is never so little conversant in the Records of those times; and in such a man it must be height of folly or impudence to deny it. The bare asserting

ſerting of it ſhall be ſufficient; becauſe to inſiſt upon the proof of it by an enumeration of particulars, would ſwell this Diſcourſe beyond meaſure; and beſides, it would be a needleſs labour, ſince the great Patrons of ſitting, or the common Table-geſture, do frankly own and acknowledge that Standing was a poſture generally uſed by the ancient Church in her religious Aſſemblies, both at their ordinary Prayers, and at the Communion-ſervice. Howſoever, I ſhall be forced to ſay ſomething concerning this matter under the following Particular.

Gilleſp. Diſp. againſt En. Po. Cer. point. 16ão. p. 190. 191.

(5.) Which is this: That the Primitive Chriſtians (though on the Lords days, and for the ſpace of 50 days between *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday* they obſerved Standing, yet at other times) uſed the geſture of Kneeling at their publick Devotions. Which will appear from a Decree paſs'd in the firſt general Council aſſembled at *Nice*, in words to this effect: *Becauſe there are ſome which Kneel on the Lords day, and in the days of Pentecoſt*, (that is, between *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday*) *it is therefore ordained by this holy Synod, that when we pay our vows unto the Lord in Prayer, we obſerve a Standing geſture, to the end that a uniform and agreeable Cuſtom may be maintained or ſecured through all Churches.* By which Canon proviſion was made againſt Kneeling, not as if it were an inconvenient and unbecoming geſture to be uſed at all in the publick Worſhip of God, but onely as being an irregular and unfit poſture to be uſed at ſuch particular times and occaſions as is there ſpecified, *viz.* on the Lords days, and the Feaſt of Pentecoſt; when for any Chriſtian to ſtand, was to croſs the general Cuſtom and Practice of the Church at that time: For this Council did not (you muſt note) introduce and eſta-

Can. 20. about the year 325.

bliſh any new thing in the Church, but onely endeavoured by its authority to keep alive and in credit an ancient Cuſtom, which they ſaw began to be neglected by ſome Chriſtians. And from that clauſe in the Canon, *Becauſe there are ſome which Kneel on the Lords day and in the days of Pentecoſt*, &c. we may with good reaſon infer, that Kneeling was the poſture that was generally uſed at other times in their religious Aſſemblies. For if ſtanding had been generally obſerved by all Churches in time of Divine Service at all other times as well as thoſe mentioned in the Decree, what occaſion or neceſſity had there been for ſuch an Injunction, whereby all Chriſtians were obliged to do that which they conſtantly and univerſally did before? There is a paſſage in the Author of the Queſtions and Anſwers in *Juſtin Martyr*, which will put this matter out of doubt, and give us the reaſon why they altered their poſture on the Lords day: *It is* (ſaith he) *that by this means we may be put in mind both of our Fall by Sin, and our Reſurrection and Reſtitution by the Grace of Chriſt: that for ſix days we pray upon our Knees, is in token of our Fall by Sin; but that on the Lords day we do not bow the Knee, doth ſymbolically repreſent our Reſurrection*, &c. This he there tells us was a Cuſtom derived from the very times of the Apoſtles; for which he cites *Irenæus* in his Book concerning *Eaſter*. That it was ancient, appears from *Tertullian*, who lived in the ſame Age with *Irenæus*, and ſpeaks of it as if it had been eſtabliſht by Apoſtolical Authority, or at leaſt by Cuſtom had obtained the force of a Law; for theſe are his words: *We eſteem it a great act of wickedneſs or villany, either to faſt or kneel on the Lords day*. Which intimates too, that Faſting and Kneeling in their publick Worſhip, were both lawful and cuſtomary

Reſponſ. ad queſt. 115. p. 468.

Ann. Dom. 198.

Die dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare.

mary at other times. To whose Testimony if we joyn that of another Father who lived some time after the first general *Nicene* Council, we need not produce any more witnesses to clear the matter. It is that of *Epiphanius* in his exposition of the Catholick Faith; where he certifies, *that the weekly stated Fasts (of Wednesday and Fryday) were diligently kept by the Catholick Church the whole year round, excepting the fifty days of Pentecost, on which they do not Kneel, nor is there any Fast appointed.* The reason of which Custom was (as both St. *Jerome* and St. *Augustin* attest) because all that space between *Easter* and *Whitsunday* was *a time of joy and triumph,* viz. over Death and the Grave; *and therefore on these days we neither Fast nor bend our Knees, nor incline and bow down our Bodies, but with our Lord are lifted up to Heaven. We pray standing* (all that time) *which is a sign of the Resurrection.* By which posture, that is, we signifie our belief of that Article. From whence we may conclude, that as the Christians of those first Ages did at other times certainly Fast, so they did also certainly kneel at their Prayers in their publick and religious Assemblies.

Tert. de Cor. mil. c. 3. p. 206. Col. Agrip. edit. 1617.

Epiph. exposit. Fid. Cathol. p. 1105. edit. Par. Flor. *An. Dom.* 390. ἐν αἷς, ὅτι γονυκλισίαι γίνονται οὔτε νηστεία προστέτακται.

St. *Hieronym.* prolog. Comment. in Ep. ad *Ephes.*

St. *August.* Ep. 119. ad *Jan.* c. 15.

(6.) Another thing I would have observed in order to my present design, is this; That the Primitive Christians were wont to receive the Holy Sacrament every day, as oft as they came together for publick Worship: which Custom as it was introduced and practised by the Apostles themselves (according to the judgement of very Learned men, and that not without good grounds from the holy Scripture) so it continued a considerable time in the Church, even down to St. *Austin*, who flourisht in the

Acts 2. 42, 46. *Acts* 20. 7. compared with 1 *Cor.* 10. 16.

Ann. Dom. 410. St. *Aug.* Epist. 118. ad *Januarium*, c. 2, 3. p. 556. 7. *Basil.* edit. a Froben. 1541. St. *Ambr.* cap. ult. lib. 5. c. 4. de Sacram, p. 449. *Paris.* St. *Hier.* adver. *Jovinian.* p. 37. *Paris.* id. in Epist. ad *Lucinium Bæticum*, p. 71. edit.

beginning of the fifth Century; and ſeems clearly to intimate to us in his Writings, that it was cuſtomary in his days, as St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Hierome* had hinted before him concerning the Churches of *Millan* and *Rome* in their times. From St. *Cyprian* we are fully aſſured that it was ſo in his days, *viz.* about the year 250. For in his explication of that Petition in the Lords Prayer, *Give us this day our daily bread*, he expreſly tells us, *that they did receive the Euchariſt every day, as the food that nouriſht them to Salvation.* St. *Baſil* Biſhop of *Cæſaria*, who lived about 370 years after Chriſt, affirms, that in his Church they Communicated *four times a Week*; on the *Lords day, Wedneſday, Friday, and Saturday*; two of which were ſtation-days, or ſet days of Faſting which were punctually obſerved by the generality of Chriſtians in thoſe times. And this I the rather note, becauſe in all probability, ſince they did receive the Sacrament on theſe days, they did not alter the poſture of the day, but received Kneeling: For if Kneeling was adjudged by the Catholick Church an unſutable and improper poſture for times of mirth and joy, ſuch as the *Lords days* and thoſe of *Pentecoſt* were; and if they were thought guilty of a great irregularity, who uſed that poſture on thoſe *Feſtivals*; then we may reaſonably conclude, that Standing, which was the *Feſtival Poſture*, was not uſed by the Catholick Church on days of *Faſting and Humiliation*; and that they who ſtood at their publick Devotions on *Faſting days*, were as irregular as they who kneel'd on a *Feſtival*. And that this was really ſo, may, I think, be clearly collected from a paſſage in *Tertullian* to this purpoſe; *We judge it an unlawful and impious thing* (ſays he) *either to Faſt or Kneel at our Devotions on the Lords day. We rejoyce in the ſame freedom or immunity from* Eaſter *to* Whit-

Vid. Dr. *Cave*, Prim. Chriſt. p. 339.

St. *Cypr.* de Orat. Dom. p. 147. Oxon. edit. 1682.

Can. 9. Apoſt. & Antiochen. Concil. Can 2.

Baſil. Ep. 289. ad Cæſariam Patriciam, To. 3. p. 279.

Tertull. de Orat. c. 3. p. 206. Edit. Col. Agrip. 1617.

Whitſontide. To be freed and exempted from Faſting and Kneeling, not onely on the Lords day, but all the days of Pentecoſt, was eſteemed a great priviledge, and matter of much joy to this Holy Father, and the Chriſtians who lived in his days. And from hence I infer, that at other times, when they met together for publick Worſhip, (eſpecially on days of Faſting) they generally uſed Kneeling, and that at the Lords Supper, which was adminiſtred every day in the *African* Church, whereof *Tertullian* was a Presbyter. For if they had generally ſtood at all other times of the year in their religious Aſſemblies, as well at their Prayers as at the Lords Supper, where is the priviledge and immunity they boaſted ſo much of, and rejoyced in, *viz.* that they were freed from Kneeling on ſuch days and at ſuch certain times? Not to Faſt on the Lords day was a Priviledge, becauſe they did Faſt on the Week-days; and ſo ſay I of Standing: To Stand on the Lords days, and all the time between *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday*, could not be thought a ſpecial act of favour and the Prerogative of thoſe ſeaſons, if Kneeling had not been the ordinary and common Geſture at all other times throughout the year. And if Kneeling was the Geſture which the Chriſtians did then commonly uſe at their Prayers on the Week-days; then in all probability, when they received the Sacrament on thoſe days, they received in the ordinary poſture.

So St. *Cyprian* before cited.

Didoclavius his own argument retorted. *Si ſtabant inter orandum (viz. Die Dominico & toto temporis intervallo inter Paſcha & Pentecoſten) non eſt probabile de geniculis adoraſſe cum perciperent Euchariſtiam, ſed potius contrarium, nempe ſtetiſſe.* Altar. Damaſc. p. 784.

The (7th) and laſt particular which I would obſerve relating to this buſineſs, is this; That the Primitive Chriſtians received the Holy Sacrament Praying. The whole Communion-Service was performed with Prayer and Praiſe. It was begun with a general Prayer, wherein the Miniſter and the whole Congregation joyntly

Tert. Apol. c. 39. p. 47. St. Aug. Ep. 118. Const. Apost. l. 2. c. 57. p. 881. St. Chrys. Hom. 1. in 2. cap. Epist. 1. Tim.

joyntly prayed *for the universal Peace and Welfare of the Church, for the Tranquillity and the quietness of the World, for the Prosperity of the Age, for wholesome Weather and fruitful Seasons, for Kings and Emperours, and all in authority*, &c. The Elements were sanctified by a solemn Benediction, the form whereof is set down by St. *Ambrose*; and the whole action was concluded with Prayer and Thanksgiving. But that which more particularly affects the matter in hand, is, that the Minister used a Prayer at the delivery of the Sacrament to each Communicant, to which every one at their receiving said *Amen*.

De Sacr. lib. 4. c. 5. p. 439. See Dr. *Cave's* Primitive Christianity, c. 11. p. 347.

The Apostolical Constitutions, though in some things much corrupted and adulterated, yet in many things are very sound, and in this particular seem to express the most Ancient Practice of the Church. For there we find this Account.

Mr. *Daillé* sets them at the latter end of the 5 Century.

The Apostolical Constitutions (confessed by all hands to be very Ancient, though not altogether so much as is pretended in some things) give us this plain acount in these words: *Let the Bishop give the Sacrifice* (by which name the Holy Sacrament was called in Primitive times) *saying, The Body of Christ: and let him that receives say* Amen. *Then let the Deacon take the Cup, and at the delivery say, The Blood of Christ, the Cup of Life; and let him that drinketh say* Amen.

Const. Apost. lib. 8. c. 13. p. 483.

Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπίσκοπος δίδότω τῷ προσφορὰν λέγων, σῶμα χριστοῦ. καὶ ὁ ἀναγνώστης λεγέτω ἀμήν. ὁ δὲ διάκονος καπιχέτω τὸ ποτήριον, καὶ ὁπηνίκα λεγέτω, αἷμα χριστοῦ, ποτήριον ζωῆς; καὶ ὁ πίνων λεγέτω Ἀμήν.

Now although it cannot be denied but that these Constitutions are in many things adulterated, yet it is allowed on the other hand, that in many things they are very sincere, and convey to us the pure Practice of the most ancient times. That they give a true and sound account

account in this matter relating to the Sacrament, we may reſt fully ſatisfied, from the concurring Evidence of other ancient Writers who lived in the fourth Century: For both St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* make expreſs mention of the peoples ſaying *Amen* when the Miniſter ſaid *The Body of Chriſt*. So alſo St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of it as univerſally practiſed by the Church of Chriſt when the Cup was delivered. And there is a very remarkable paſſage recorded by *Euſebius* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which being very appoſite to our purpoſe, I will ſet down for the cloſe of all.

Ambr. de Sacr. lib 4. c. 5. p. 440. To. 4. St. *Cyril.* Hiero. Catech. Myſtag. 5. Univerſa Eccleſia accepto Chriſti Sanguine dicit Amen. Reſp. ad *Oroſi.* queſt. 49. To. 4. p. 691. Baſil. 1541.

Novatus a Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, having renounc'd the Communion of the Church and the Authority of his rightful Biſhop *Cornelius*, ſet up for himſelf, and became the head of an unreaſonable and unnatural Schiſm; and the better to ſecure to him the Proſelytes he had gained, he altered the uſual form of Prayer at the Sacrament, and in the room thereof, ſubſtituted a new-fangled Oath which he obliged every Communicant to take at the time of their receiving; which (among other wicked actions) is particularly taken notice of and charged upon him by *Cornelius*, as the worſt of all, and the moſt villanous Innovation. *When he came* (ſays he) *to offer Sacrifices* (i. e. to celebrate the Lords Supper) *and to diſtribute to every one his part, at the delivery of it he conſtrained thoſe perſons who unhappily ſided with him to take an Oath, inſtead of offering up Prayers and Praiſes according to cuſtom; and inſtead of ſaying* Amen, *he forced every Communicant when he received the Bread, to ſay, I will never return to* Cornelius *as long as I live.*

Epiſt. *Cornel.* ad *Fab.* apud *Euſeb.* Eccleſ. Hiſt. lib. 6. c. 35. de *Novato.*

Ποιήσας γὰρ τὰς προσφορὰς, καὶ διανέμων ἑκάστῳ τὸ μέρος, καὶ ἐπιδιδοὺς τοῦτο ὀμνύειν ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐλογεῖν τοὺς ταλαιπώρους ἀνθρώπους ἀναγκάζει, &c. καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν λαμβάνοντα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκεῖνον, τὸ Ἀμὴν, οὐκέτι ἀνήξω πρὸς Κορνέλιον.

From theſe plain inſtances we may ſee how cloſely our

our Church follows the ſteps of pure Antiquity in the Form of Prayer appointed to be uſed by the Miniſter at the giving of the Bread and the Cup to the people; which runs thus: *The Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and *The Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt preſerve thy Body and Soul to everlaſting life*, &c. which laſt Clauſe was added by later times, by way of explication, to that ſhort Form which the Primitive Church uſed: and ſurely it's every Chriſtians intereſt, as well as his duty, to joyn with the Miniſter in ſuch a Prayer, and return a hearty *Amen* to it.

I will now briefly ſum up the Evidence that hath been produced out of Antiquity in juſtification of Kneeling at the Holy Communion, according to the cuſtom and practice of our Church; and obſerve where it directs us to fix, and what to reſolve upon. And in this order it lies: Sitting was adjudged by the ancient Catholick Church a very unfit and irreverent poſture to be uſed in time of Divine Service when they were ſolemnly engaged in the Worſhip of God; the Holy Sacrament was eſteemed the moſt ſolemn Act or Branch of Chriſtian Worſhip; The Primitive Chriſtians generally uſed ſtanding at their publick Devotions, onely on the Lords days, and all that ſpace of time that falls between *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday*; At all other times in their religious Aſſemblies Kneeling was their Worſhipping poſture; And they were wont to meet and receive the Lords Supper every day, and particularly on their ſtated Weekly Faſts, which they kept every *Wedneſday* and *Friday*, when to Stand was thought as great an irregularity, as to kneel was on the Lords day: And laſtly, the Holy Sacrament was delivered and received with a Form of Prayer, and that on thoſe days when they conſtantly prayed Kneeling. All theſe things

things therefore being conſidered, I think the leaſt that can be concluded from them, is what I aſſerted and deſigned, *viz.* that in all likelihood the Primitive Chriſtians did kneel at the Holy Communion, as the Cuſtom is in the Church of *England:* For Sitting was generally condemned as an indecent and irreverent Geſture by the Primitive Church; and no man in his wits will ſay that Proſtration or lying flat upon the ground was ever uſed in the act of Receiving, or ever fit to be ſo: it muſt be therefore one of theſe two; either Standing or Kneeling.

As for Standing all the time of publick Worſhip which was uſed onely on the Lords day and in Pentecoſt, the reaſon thereof was drawn not from the Sacrament, but from the day and feſtival ſeaſon, when they did more particularly commemorate the Reſurrection of our bleſſed Saviour, and openly teſtified their belief of that great Article; at ſuch times therefore they choſe Standing, as being a geſture ſutable to the preſent occaſion, and as an Emblem and ſign of the Reſurrection.

And from hence I gather, that on their common and ordinary days (when there was no peculiar reaſon to invite or oblige them to ſtand at the Sacrament) in all likelihood they uſed Kneeling, that is, the ordinary poſture. They uſed one and the ſame poſture (*viz. Standing*) both at their Prayers and at the Sacrament on the Lords day, and for fiftie days after *Eaſter*, contrary to what was uſual at all other times; and why then ſhould any man think they did not obſerve one and the ſame poſture at all other times? *viz.* that as at ſuch times they did conſtantly Kneel at their Prayers, ſo they did alſo conſtantly Kneel at the Sacrament, which was given and received in a Prayer.

From the ſtrength of theſe Premiſes, I may howſoever promiſe my ſelf thus much ſucceſs: That whoſoever ſhall carefully weigh and peruſe them with a teachable and unprejudiced mind, ſhall find himſelf much more inclin'd to believe the Primitive Church uſed at ſome times to Kneel (as we do) at the Holy Communion, than that they never did Kneel at all, or that ſuch a poſture was never uſed nor heard of, but excluded from their Congregations, as ſome great advocates for Sitting have confidently proclaimed it to the World.

(2.) But ſecondly, Suppoſe they never did Kneel as we do, yet this is moſt certain, that they received the Lords Supper in an adoring poſture; which is the ſame thing, and will ſufficiently juſtifie the preſent practice of our Church, as being agreeable to that of pure Antiquity. For the proof of this, numerous teſtimonies both of Greek and Latine Fathers might be alledged, but I will content my ſelf (and I hope the Reader too) with a few of each ſort, which are ſo plain and expreſs, that he who will except againſt them, will alſo with the ſame face and aſſurance except againſt the Whiteneſs of Snow, and the Light of the Sun at Noonday.

St. *Cyril.* Hieroſol. Myſtag. Catech. 5. verſus finem. Pariſ. edit. p. 244.

And firſt for the Greek Fathers, let the teſtimonie of St. *Cyril* be heard, than which nothing can be more plain and expreſs to our purpoſe: This holy Father in a place before cited, gives inſtructions to Communicants how to behave themſelves when they approach the Lords Table, and that in the act of receiving both the Bread and the Wine. At the receiving of the Cup he adviſes thus: *Approach* (ſaies he) *not rudely ſtretching forth thy hands, but bowing thy ſelf, and in a poſture of*

Κύπτων καὶ τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν. P. 245. A.

of Worſhip and Adoration, ſaying Amen. To the ſame purpoſe St. *Chryſoſtome* ſpeaks in his 24th Homily on the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*; Where he provokes and excites the Chriſtians of his time, to an awful and reverential deportment at the Holy Communion, by the example of the Wiſe men who adored our Saviour in his Infancy, after this manner: *This Body the wiſe men reverenced even when it lay in the Manger, and approaching thereto, worſhipped it with fear and great trembling. Let us therefore who are Citizens of Heaven, imitate at leaſt theſe Barbarians. But thou ſeeſt this Body, not in the Manger, but on the Altar; not held by a Woman, but by the Prieſt,* &c. *Let us therefore ſtir up our ſelves, and be horribly afraid, and manifeſt a much greater Reverence than thoſe Barbarians, leſt coming lightly and at a venture, we heap fire on our heads.* In another place the ſame Father expreſly bids them to *fall down and communicate*, when the Table was prepared, and the King himſelf preſent: and in order to beget in their minds great and awful thoughts concerning that holy and myſterious Feaſt, he further adviſes them, *that when they ſaw the Chancel doors opened, then they ſhould ſuppoſe Heaven it ſelf was unfolded from above, and that the Angels deſcended*, to be ſpectators I ſuppoſe he means of their carriage and behaviour at the Lords Table, and by giving their attendance to grace the ſolemnity. With the Teſtimony of theſe ancient Writers *Theodoret* concurs, who in a Dialogue between an Orthodox Chriſtian and an Heretick, introduces *Orthodoxus* thus diſcourſing concerning the Lords Supper. The myſterious Symbols or ſigns in the Sacrament (*viz. Bread and Wine*) depart not from their proper nature, for

Matth. 2, 1. 11.

Διαναςήσωμεν τοίνυν ἑαυτοὺς καὶ φοβέξωμεν, καὶ πολλῷ τῷ βαρβάρων ἐκείνων πλείονα δῶμεν εὐλάβειαν ἵνα μὴ ἀπλῶς, μηδὲ ὡς ἔτυχε, προσελθόντες πῦρ ὀπὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν συρεύσωμεν κεφαλάς. 24 Hom. Ep. ad. Cor. p. 538. To. 9. Pariſ.

ἀνάπεσον, καὶ μέτεχε. St. Chryſ. Hom. 3. in Ep. ad Epheſ. in moral. p. 1151.

Flor. A. D. 440

they abide in their former essence, and retain their former shape and form; and approve themselves both to our sight and touch to be what they were before: *but they are considered for such as they are made,* (that is, with respect to their Spiritual signification, and that Divine use to which they were consecrated) *and are believed and adored as those very things which they are believed to be.* Which words clearly import thus much, that the consecrated Elements were received with a gesture of Adoration, and withal assure us, that such a carriage at the Sacrament was not built upon the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. For there is not a clearer instance in all Antiquity against that absurd Doctrine which the Church of *Rome* so obstinately believes at this day, than what *Theodoret* furnisheth us with in the words above mentioned. Lastly, (to produce no more out of the Greek Fathers) that story which *Gregory Nazianzen* relates concerning his Sister *Gorgonia,* will serve to corroborate what hath been said, *viz.* That being sick, and having made use of several Remedies to no purpose, at last she resolved upon this course: In the stilness of the night she repaired to the publick Church, and being provided with some of the consecrated Elements which she had reserved at home, *she fell down on her Knees before the Altar,* and with a loud voice supplicated him whom she adored, and in conclusion was made whole. I am not much concerned whether the Reader shall think fit to believe or censure the Miracle; but it's certain that this famous Bishop hath put it upon Record, and applauds his Sister for the method she used for her recovery, and which speaks home to my purpose; it's clearly intimated that this pious Woman did Kneel, or use an adoring posture at least when she eat the Sacramental Bread. And there is no doubt to be

Νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ ἐγένετο καὶ πιστεύεται, καὶ προσκυνεῖται ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα, ἅπερ πιστεύεται.
Dialog. 2. To. 4. p. 85. Paris. edit.

Gregor. Naz. Orat. in laud. *Gorg.* p. 187. Paris. edit. *Gregor.* Flor. *Ann. Dom.* 370.

be made but *Gorgonia* in Communicating obſerved the ſame poſture that others generally did in publick: She did that in her ſickneſs, which all others were wont to do in their health when they came to the Lords Table; *i. e.* fall down and Kneel. For it is not to be imagined that at ſuch a time as this, when ſhe came to beg ſo great a Bleſſing at Gods hands in the publick Church at the Altar, ſtiled by the Ancients the Place of Prayer, ſhe would be guilty of any irregularity, and uſe a ſingular Poſture different from what was generally uſed by Chriſtians when they came to the ſame place to Communicate and pray over the great Propitiatory Sacrifice; which they eſteemed the moſt powerful and effectual way of Praying, the moſt likely to render God propitious, and to prevail with him above all other Prayers which they offered at any other time, or in any other place. So much for the Teſtimonies of the Greek Fathers, who were men famous for Learning and Piety in their generations, and great Lights and Ornaments in the ancient Church. With theſe the Latine Fathers perfectly agree in their judgements concerning our preſent ſubject. And of theſe I will onely mention two (though more might be produced) for brevity ſake, and they very eminent and illuſtrious perſons, held in great eſteem by the then preſent Age wherein they flouriſh'd, and by all ſucceeding Generations. The firſt is St. *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Millain* in a Book he wrote concerning the Holy Spirit, where inquiring after the meaning of the Pſalmiſt when he exhorts men to exalt the Lord and to worſhip his Footſtool, he gives us the ſenſe in theſe words: That it ſeems to belong unto the myſtery of our Lords Incarnation; and then proceeds to ſhew for what reaſon it may be accommodated to that myſterie: and at laſt con-

Flor. A.D. 370

Pſal. 98. Pſ. 99. 5. in our Tranſlation.

Ambroſ. de Sp. Sto. l. 3. c. 12.

concludes thus: *By the Footſtool therefore is the earth to be underſtood, and by the earth the Body of Chriſt, which at this day too we adore in the Sacrament, and which the Apoſtles worſhipt in the Lord Jeſus,* &c. On the very ſame words St. *Auſtin* (Biſhop of *Hippo*) comments, and to the ſame purpoſe. For thus he reſolves that queſtion, how or in what ſence the earth his Footſtool may be worſhipped without Impiety? *Becauſe he took earth of the earth, for fleſh is of the earth; and he took fleſh of the fleſh of* Mary. *And becauſe he converſed here in the fleſh, and gave us his very fleſh to eat unto Salvation. Now there is none who eateth that fleſh, but firſt worſhippeth. We have found then how this Footſtool may be adored; ſo that we are ſo far from ſinning by adoring, that we really ſin if we do not Adore.* In the judgement therefore of theſe Primitive Biſhops, we may lawfully adore at the Myſteries, though not the Myſteries themſelves; at the Sacraments, not the Sacraments themſelves; the Creator in the Creature which is ſanctified, not the Creature it ſelf: as a late Proteſtant Writer of prime Quality and Learning among the French, diſtinguiſhes upon the forecited words of St. *Ambroſe*.

Itaq; per Scabellum terra intelligitur, per terram autem caro Chriſti, quam hodie quoque in myſteriis adoramus, & quam Apoſtoli in Dom. Jeſu adorarunt.

Nemo carnem illam manducat, niſi prius adoraverit.

Phil. Mornay du Pleſſis de Miſſa, l. 4. c. 7. p. 732.

From theſe few Inſtances I think it appears evident, that the Primitive Chriſtians uſed an adoring poſture at the Sacrament in the act of Receiving. It were eaſie to heap together many other Witneſſes, if it were neceſſary ſo to do, either to prove or clear the Cauſe in hand: but ſince there is no need, to peſter the Diſcourſe with numerous references and appeals to Antiquity, would but puzzle and obſcure the Argument, and tend in all likelihood rather to confound and diſguſt, than convince and gratifie the Reader.

By what hath been alleadged, the practice of our Church in Kneeling at the Sacrament is ſufficiently juſtified,

ſtified, as agreeable to the Cuſtoms and Practice of pure Antiquity. For if the Ancients did at the Sacrament uſe a poſture of Worſhip and Adoration, (which that they did, is very plain) then Kneeling is not repugnant to the practice of the Church in the firſt and pureſt Ages; no, though we ſhould ſuppoſe that Kneeling was never practiſed among them: which will appear, if we caſt our eyes a little upon that heavie Charge which ſome of the fierceſt but leſs prudent Adverſaries of Kneeling have drawn up againſt it. They object againſt Kneeling, as being an Adoring geſture; For they affirm, *That to kneel in the act of Receiving, before the conſecrated Bread and Wine, is formal Idolatry. So alſo to kneel before any Creature as a memorative object of God, though there be no intention of giving divine Adoration to that Creature, is Idolatry.* Now if the Primitive Chriſtians may be ſuppoſed to proſtrate themſelves before the Altar upon their firſt approach thither in order to receive, or immediately after they had received the Bread and the Cup from the hand of the Miniſter; or if they bowed their Heads and Bodies after a lowly manner, in the act of Receiving; or if they received ſtanding upright, and eat and drank at the Lords Table with their Hands and Eyes lifted up to Heaven; then they were guilty of Idolatry, as well as we who kneel at the Sacrament, in the judgement of thoſe *Scotch Caſuiſts*; and conſequently, Kneeling at the holy Communion, according to the Cuſtom of our Church, is not contrary to the practice of the Church of Chriſt in the firſt and pureſt Ages. For all thoſe Poſtures before mentioned were Poſtures of Worſhip and Adoration, and uſed as ſuch by the Primitive Chriſtians: eſpecially ſtanding, which is allowed by the Patrons of Sitting to be anciently and moſt generally uſed in time of Divine

Gilleſp. p. 166. 172. Altar. Damaſ. p. 801. *Rutherf.* Divine Right of Ch. Gov. c. 1. Qu. 5. Sec. 1, 3.

Gilleſp. Diſp. againſt E. Po: Cer. p. 191. Diſp. of kneel. P. 93.

vine Worſhip, and particularly in the act of Receiving.

I will conclude all with an Inſtance in their own Caſe about a common Table-geſture. Suppoſe the Primitive Chriſtians did in ſome places receive the Holy Sacrament Sitting, or lying along upon Beds, as the ancient Cuſtom was in thoſe Eaſtern Countries, at their common and ordinary Tables: Put the caſe that in other places they ſate croſs-legg'd on Carpets at the Lords Supper, as the *Turks* and *Perſians* eat at this day; or that they received Standing in other places, according to the common mode of Feaſting; which we will ſuppoſe only at preſent. Could any man now reaſonably object againſt the lawfulneſs of Sitting upright at the Sacrament upon a Form or Chair (according to the Cuſtom of *England*) as being contrary to the practice of all Antiquity, who never ſate at all? Certainly no. For though they differ from the Ancients as to the Site of their Bodies, and the particular mode of Receiving, yet they all agree in this, that they receive in a common Table-geſture: They all uſe the ſame Geſture at the Sacrament, that they conſtantly uſed at their civil Feaſts and ordinary Entertainments in the ſeveral places of their abode. And ſo ſay I in the preſent caſe; What though the Primitive Chriſtians ſtood upright ſome of them at the Sacrament, and others bowed their Heads and Bodies in the act of Receiving, and none of them ever uſed Kneeling? Yet they and we do very well agree for all that, becauſe we all receive in an Adoring or Worſhipping Poſture. It is one and the ſame thing variouſly expreſt according to the modes of different Countries.

QUE-

Query V.

Whether it be unlawful to Receive Kneeling, becauſe this Geſture was firſt introduced by Idolaters, and is ſtill notoriouſly abuſed by the Papiſts to idolatrous ends and purpoſes.

ALl that is needful to be ſaid for ſatisfaction in this Caſe, may be comprized under theſe two Propoſitions, which I will endeavour to make good.

(1) It can never be proved that Kneeling in the Act of Receiving was firſt brought in by Idolaters, as is pretended and ſuppoſed in the Queſtion.

(2) That it is not ſinful to uſe ſuch Things and Rites as either have been or are notoriouſly abuſed to Idolatry.

As to the firſt of theſe Propoſitions, I have in my Anſwer to the fourth Query made it (I think) appear very probable, *That the Church of Chriſt in the firſt and pureſt Ages did Kneel, as we do at this day, in the Act of Receiving.* And if this be allowed, then they who oppoſe Kneeling will be unavoidably driven upon one of theſe two things: Either they muſt pronounce the Primitive Chriſtians guilty of Idolatry, or not guilty.

If they ſay *they* were Idolaters, then the former Objection againſt Kneeling contained in the fourth Query is void of all ſenſe, and falls to the ground; *viz. That Kneeling is contrary to the general practice of pure Antiquity.* If they were clear from Idolatry, then the preſent Objection comes to nothing; *viz. That Kneeling is unlawful, as being firſt introduced by Idolaters.*

But ſecondly, to come cloſe to the Queſtion, let us try if we can find the time *when*, and the idolatrous perſons *by whom* Kneeling was firſt brought into practice. And ſurely there are none ſo likely to inform us, as they who raiſe the Objection; for if they do not make out theſe particulars, they talk at random, and ſay nothing to the purpoſe. And what are the clear and undeniable Proofs (for ſuch I am ſure they ought to be in this caſe) which they produce to make good this Charge againſt Kneeling? No other than theſe, that I can find by my beſt ſearch into the Writings of the moſt learned Advocates for Sitting. *Kneeling in the Act of Receiving the Euchariſt was not known to the Church for a thouſand years, &c. It was never known to the Church and Fathers before that monſtrous Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation ſprung up and grew ſtrong in the world. It was inſtituted by Antichriſt, and that in honour of the Breaden God, and to confirm the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation and the carnal preſence.* Nay the ſame Author affirms, that this Geſture *was never uſed before the time of* Honorius; and challenges all the world to produce one Teſtimony before that Age for the uſe of it; and withal acknowledges at the ſame time, that *Honorius* did not inſtitute Kneeling in the Act of Receiving.

Altar. Damaſcen. p. 542. c. 9 de Adiaph.

Id. c. 10. p. 780. 782.

784.

This is *Didoclave* alias *Claderwood* his Account; which is ſo blind and confuſed, and inconſiſtent with it ſelf, that

that it proves nothing, but that the Author had a great mind to ſay ſomewhat to the purpoſe, but knew not what or how. It was unknown, he ſaith, to the Church for a thouſand years; and again, not known till Tranſubſtantiation ſprung up and grew to Maturity; and again, never uſed till the time of Pope *Honorius*, who lived about the beginning of the Thirteenth Century, and came to the Papacy in the year 1216. Now it's ſtrange to me how Kneeling at the Sacrament ſhould be known about a thouſand years after Chriſt, and yet never uſed till the year 1216, or thereabouts: This is all one with ſaying, Playing upon Organs was never heard of nor known till the Reign of King *Henry* the Seventh, but then Organs were never play'd upon till King *James* came to the Crown. And then again, though Kneeling was brought in by Antichriſt, it was not brought in by *Honorius*, but in his time onely. All the light therefore that this Author (who hath taken as much pains, and ſhewed as much Learning as any man whatſoever in defence of Sitting) affords us, is only this: That Kneeling was brought in at ſome time or other, but he could not well tell when; and by ſomebody or other, what do ye call him? but it's uncivil to name names.

The other Adverſaries of Kneeling are very bold in their general Charge as any men can be, but very ſhie of coming to Particulars. *The man of ſin was the Author and* (to make all ſure) *the Mother of it*, ſays one. *It grew firſt from the perſwaſion of the real preſence, and this when Antichriſt was at his full height*, ſays another. *And in the groſſeſt time of Idolatry that the eye of the Chriſtian World hath ſeen. If when* Honorius (as the Diſputer proceeds) *made his Decree for Adoring the Sacrament, Kneeling were not in uſe*, what follows from hence? Why *then in all probability Kneeling at the Communion*

Diſp. againſt Kneel. p. 99. Abridg. p. 30, 31.

Diſp. p. 99.

p. 94.

munion was not received into practice in any Age preceding the days of Honorius. *But when* Honorius *made his Decree for Adoring the Sacrament, Kneeling was not in use:* that is, If Kneeling were not in use when *Honorius* made his Decree, then it never was in use before. What Shifts are men put to, when they undertake to defend an ill Cause! Who is there so ignorant, as not to know that things may grow out of fashion and use? What for some Ages was a general and prevailing Custom, may in tract of time wear off, and dwindle to nothing. I need say no more to expose the weakness of this Argument, than to put it thus: Sitting was not in use in the time of *Honorius*, therefore in all probability it was never in use in any preceding Age.

After all too, it's strange that Kneeling at the Sacrament should spring (as these Writers affirm) from that monstrous Doctrine of Transubstantiation and a Conceit of the corporal presence of Christ, and not be in use in the days of *Honorius* when he made the Decree of Adoration: Because that Doctrine had been disputed many years before among learned men, and was established by Papal authority in the year 1215. before *Honorius* was elected Pope. But to pass by this, it appears from the Writings of these men, that they unanimously agree in this: Kneeling was brought in by the *man of sin*, by *Antichrist*, after *Transubstantiation* sprung up, and in the time of *Honorius* the Third. They all agree too, in talking confidently and at large concerning this matter, without all Reason or Proof to make out their Assertion, but It is so, and It must needs be so, right or wrong: and the common People swallow all for Gospel, and have got *Honorius* his name by the end, and so the matter is determined.

However, thus much I think is gained in favour of Kneeling,

Kneeling, from what theſe our great Adverſaries ſay againſt it; *That it was not introduced by any Pope of* Rome. For when they ſay the *man of ſin* was the Mother of Kneeling, and *Antichriſt* brought it in, if they mean by thoſe Phraſes (as they generally in their other Writings do) the *Pope* or the Biſhop of *Rome*, then the matter is out of doubt, they themſelves being Judges. Becauſe they expreſly affirm, that Kneeling was never practiſed before Pope *Honorius* his time; and even then it was not inſtituted by him, but by ſome body elſe. But if by the man of ſin and Antichriſt, they mean any number or Society of men, as the *Conclave of Cardinals*, ſuppoſe, or ſome prevailing Faction in a *Provincial* or *General Council*, ſpurr'd on by Avarice and Ambition to enlarge and ſupport the Popes Authority; then it's very ſtrange, and unaccountable, that their Conſtitutions and Decrees for Kneeling ſhould nowhere be found, nor the leaſt mention made in any Records or Hiſtories concerning ſuch a matter. That there are none ſuch to be met with any where, I will appeal to Mr. *Prynne*, as good a Terrier as ever lived, and no Friend to Kneeling. *There is not one Canon to be found* (ſays he) *made by any General, National, Provincial Council or Synod, from Chriſts inſtitution of the Lords Supper, till above* 1460 *years after his Aſcenſion: Nor any one Rubrick in all the Liturgies, Writings of the Fathers, or Miſſals, Breviaries, Offices, Pontificals, Ceremonials of the Church of* Rome *it ſelf, that I could either find upon my beſt ſearch, or any other yet produce, enjoyning Communicants to Kneel in the Act of Receiving.* Thus that inquiſitive Gentleman aſſures us; and in the ſame place backs his Report with the authority of the Reverend Dr. *Burgeſſe*, whom he ſtiles the beſt and eminenteſt Champion for this Geſture of Kneeling of all others.

Diſp. p. 81.

Altar. Dam. p. 784. c. 10.

Mr. *Prynne* Apol. for lib. to tender Con. p. 75. printed 1662.

others. The ſum of what Dr. *Burgeſſe* delivers concerning this matter, is this: *That Kneeling in the Act of Receiving was never any inſtituted Ceremony of the Church of* Rome, *nor is at this day.* For this he cites *Bellarmine* and *Durantus*, who make no mention of Kneeling in the Act of Receiving; though they treat particularly of the Maſs, and the Ceremonies of the Roman Church. Inſtead of this, *Durantus* affirms, *That the Sacrament ought to be taken Standing*; and proves it alſo. *And ſo doth the Pope himſelf receive it, when he celebrates; and every Prieſt by order of the Maſs-book, is to partake ſtanding reverently at the Altar, and not Kneeling there.* The People which receive not, as well as they that do receive, are reverently to bow themſelves to the Sacrament, not when they receive it, but when the Prieſt doth elevate the Patin or Chalice *for Adoration*, or when the Hoſt is carried to any ſick perſon, or in Proceſſion. And this is that Adoration which was firſt brought in by Pope *Honorius* the Third, and not any Kneeling or Adoration in the Act of Receiving. For theſe are the very words of the Decree: *That the Prieſts ſhould frequently inſtruct their People to bow themſelves reverently at the Elevation of the Hoſt, when Maſs was celebrated, and in like manner when the Prieſt carried it abroad to the Sick.* At the laſt the Doctor thus reſolves upon the Queſtion: *That Kneeling in the Act of Receiving was never any inſtituted Ceremony of the Church of* Rome, *nor ever uſed, when it was uſed by them, for Adoration to the Sacrament, as is falſly believed and talked of by many.* And with him a learned Papiſt agrees, who in a Book purpoſely written for the Adoration of the Sacrament, declareth, That it is not much material in what Geſture it is performed, whether

Dr. *Burg.* Anſ. rejoy. to the Reply to Dr. *Mort.* gen. Defence, p. 478, 479.

Miſſal. Rom. in the Rubr. ſet out by *Pius* V.

Ut Sacerdotes frequenter doceant Plebem ſuam, ut cum Elevatur Hoſtia Salutaris, quiſque ſe reverenter inclinet, idem faciens quum eam deferat Præsbyter ad infirmum. *Decret.* Greg. l. 3. tit. 41. c. 10.

Eſpenceus de Adorat. Euch. lib. 2. c. 16.

Sitting.

Sitting, Standing, Lying, or Kneeling: And in the ſame place further informs us, That the Kneeling Geſture had not obtained in the Church of *Lyons* in the year 1555; and when ſome endeavoured to obtrude it upon that *Metropolis*, a ſtop was put to their proceeding by the Royal Authority.

Nothing needs more be ſaid to give ſatisfaction in this matter, and fix us, when we have added what a very great man of our own Church now living hath delivered in writing, *viz. Although Kneeling at the Elevation of the Hoſt be ſtrictly required by the Roman Church, yet in the Act of Receiving it is not; as manifeſtly appears by the Popes manner of Receiving, which is not Kneeling, but either Sitting, as it was in* Bonaventure's *time; or after the faſhion of ſitting, or a little leaning upon his Throne, as he doth at this day.* Dean of St. *Paul*'s Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, p. 15.

And now the matter is brought to a fine paſs! How outragious have the Adverſaries of Kneeling been in their Clamours againſt the Church of *England* for appointing a Geſture that was firſt introduced and uſed by Antichriſt and Idolaters; and when the matter comes to be ſifted, not the leaſt proof is produced to make good the Accuſation; but, on the other ſide, it appears that thoſe two Poſtures which are ſo earneſtly contended for by our Diſſenting Brethren, are the very Poſtures which *the man of ſin* uſes at this day himſelf in the Act of Receiving the Holy Sacrament! When he celebrates Maſs himſelf, and upon ſome other particular and ſolemn occaſions, he ſtands; but generally and ordinarily he receives ſitting, or in a poſture very like it. And this I deſire may be remembred, againſt we come to diſcourſe on the ſecond Head, *viz.* that Kneeling is not therefore ſinful, becauſe it is uſed by Idolaters. *Vid.* Dr. *Falkner* liber. Eccleſ. p. 484, 485. Dr. *Burg.* lawful. of Kneel. p. 67.

If

If any ſhould after all put the Queſtion thus to me; When is it, ſay you, that Kneeling firſt commenced in the World; by whoſe means, and upon what reaſons? my plain Anſwer is, I cannot certainly tell; nor can I find any account thereof among the ancient Records. But this is no Argument *againſt*, but rather *for* the ancient and univerſal uſe of this Geſture: Novel Cuſtoms are eaſily traced to their Originals, but generally the moſt ancient Uſages of every Country are without Father and Mother; and we cannot tell from what ſource they are derived.

(2) I am ſo far from thinking (as our Diſſenting Brethren do) that Kneeling owes its birth to the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, that I verily believe the contrary: *viz.* Kneeling, or an adoring poſture uſed by the ancient Chriſtians in the Act of Receiving, did very much (among other things) conduce to beget and nurſe up in the minds of Superſtitious and Phanciful men, a Conceit, that Chriſt was really and corporally preſent at the Sacrament; which Notion, by ſubtil and inquiſitive heads, was in a little time improved and explained after this manner: That after the Elements of Bread and Wine were conſecrated, they were thereby changed into the ſubſtance of Chriſts natural Body and Bloud. This I am ſure of, that the Patrons of Tranſubſtantiation did very early make uſe of this very Argument, to prove that they taught and believed no more than what the Primitive Biſhops and Chriſtians did. For what elſe could they intend or mean (ſay they) by that extraordinary Reverence and Devotion which they manifeſted when they received the dreadful Myſteries (as they called the Bread and Wine) if they were bare and empty ſignes onely, and not changed into the very Body and Bloud of Chriſt? which

is

Cassa enim videtur tot hominum huic Sacramento ministrantium vel adorantium veneranda sedulitas, nisi ipsius Sacramenti longe major crederetur, quam videretur veritas & utilitas; cum ergo exterius, quasi nulla sint quibus tanta impenduntur venerationis obsequia, aut insensatè sumus, aut ad intima mittimus magna salutis mysteria. *Alger.* de Sacramentis, lib. 2. c. 3.

is in effect the very Argument used by * *Algerus*, a stout Champion for Transubstantiation. And † *Coster*, another Popish Writer, is so far from saying the Pope introduced it, and that after Transubstantiation took place, that he resolves it into an antient Custom continued from the Apostles times.

* A Monk of *Corbie*, who wrote against *Berengar.* and lived about the year 1074.

† *Coster.* Enchirid. p. 353. edit. 1590.

Seeing then upon the whole matter it appears by the Confession of some who oppose Kneeling, that *Honorius* did not institute or ordain that Gesture in the Act of Receiving; seeing the Decree which he made, and which others appeal to, doth not at all relate to this matter, but onely to the Adoration of the Host at the Priests elevation of it; seeing no other Pope is alledged as the Author of this Custom; seeing Kneeling was never any instituted Ceremony in the Church of *Rome*, nor is there any Canon or Decree or Rubrick extant which requires the use of that Gesture; seeing the Pope himself and the Priests who celebrate, use another Gesture in the Act of Receiving; seeing their own Writers look on it as an antient Usage derived to them from the first and purest Ages: it follows, that what is pretended and supposed in the Question, is without all Warrant and Proof, *viz.* that Kneeling in the Act of Receiving was first brought in by Idolaters.

And now to close up all, I will appeal to any man of sense and understanding, whether this be not a very silly and extravagant way of Arguing? Kneeling in the Act of Receiving is sinful, because it was first introduced by *Antichrist* and the *man of sin*, and that after the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* was started and took

place in the world; and yet after all (when you come up close to them, and enquire into particulars) they are not able to date the original of it, nor name the Authors who first invented it and set it up. At this rate of talking, it were the easiest matter imaginable to evince that Sitting and Standing were equally unlawful with Kneeling. For it is but affirming boldly that they were first brought in and used by *Idolaters*, and then the work is done effectually. And if such slender Objections must drive us away from the Lords Supper, we shall never communicate as long as we live.

But besides the folly of such Arguments, I think it's a very wicked thing for men to invent and urge them, as the Case stands with us at present: For what is there more desired and wisht for by all good Christians, than Brotherly Love and Concord? than that we may all meet together with one accord, in one place, and with one mind and one mouth glorifie God in the publick Churches? What more talkt of now adays than *Peace* and *Union*? Whosoever therefore shall any ways obstruct so blessed and desirable a Work, must be concluded a very ill man. And such a one (most certainly) is he (whatsoever we may think of it) who withdraws himself from the Holy Communion upon groundless jealousies and unreasonable fears of incurring the divine displeasure, if he receive Kneeling; and shall go about by the bugbear words of *Idolaters*, *Antichrist*, the *man of sin*, to scare weak and honest men from Receiving the Holy Sacrament in our Churches. Because the Lords Supper was instituted for this peculiar end, among others, *viz.* to be an uniting Ordinance, to bind Christians together in the strictest bonds of Love and Friendship, to dispose and engage them to put on Bowels of Mercy, to exercise the most kind and tender Affections,

and

and the moſt fervent Charity one towards another that is poſſible for men to do. Thoſe Nonconforming Miniſters therefore who poſſeſs the people with theſe Arguments (which they themſelves know, unleſs they be groſly ignorant, to be falſe and ſenſeleſs) to render them averſe from the Lords Supper as it is adminiſtred in our Churches, are in plain Engliſh the *Authors* and *Fomenters* of our *Diviſions*, and the *Diſturbers* of our *Peace*.

In the ſecond place (to proceed) it is not unlawful to uſe ſuch Things and Rites as either have been or are notoriouſly abuſed to Idolatry.

Before I produce my Reaſons for the proof of this Propoſition, I think it will not be amiſs to inform the Reader with thoſe Arguments which Diſſenters uſe to overthrow it: and they are theſe two in general.

(1) *All Things and Rites which have been notoriouſly abuſed to Idolatry, if they were ſuch as were deviſed by man, and not by God and Nature made to be of neceſſary uſe, ſhould be utterly aboliſhed and purged away from divine Worſhip. But Kneeling in the Act of Receiving is one of theſe Rites: therefore it ſhould utterly be aboliſhed.* *Gilleſp.* Eng. Pop. Cer. c. 2. par. 3. p. 130. Abridgment of Linc. Min. p. 17.

(2) *To imitate, and agree with Idolaters, by uſing ſuch Rites and Ceremonies as they do, though in themſelves indifferent, and though they contain nothing which is not agreeable to the Word of God, is ſinful.* So that not to aboliſh utterly whatſoever we know to have been abuſed heretofore to Idolatry; to take up any old Heatheniſh and Idolatrous Cuſtoms and Rites, though at preſent diſuſed by Idolaters, is ſinful: and then to uſe the ſame Rites with Idolaters at preſent, to ſort our ſelves and communicate with them in their Rites, is *Vid.* Mr. *Hook.* Eccleſ. Pol. lib. 4. p. 160. *Gilleſp.* p. 149. c. 3.

Altar. Dam. p. 536. 549. to partake of their ſins, and to become guilty of Idolatry too.

With theſe Arguments they make a great noiſe, and endeavour to confirm them by Scripture and Reaſon. I ſhall not offer at a Confutation of theſe Proofs, which ſtand built upon a weak and ſandy Foundation, upon trifling and ſorry Reaſons, upon Scripture-Precepts whoſe ſenſe is horribly wreſted, and Scripture-Examples falſly applied and nothing to the purpoſe. There is a Caſe of Conſcience lately publiſhed, wherein the Author hath done this Work to my hands: For he clearly ſhews, *That a Churches Agreeing with ſome things with the Church of* Rome, *is no Warrant for Separation from the Church ſo agreeing:* and particularly inſtanceth in our Churches agreement with the Church of *Rome* by Kneeling at the Sacrament. There you will find the moſt conſiderable Texts and Examples which they drag from Scripture and urge for themſelves, rendred utterly unſerviceable to their Cauſe, and reſcued from their Tortures.

Vid. Caſe reſolved; whether the Ch. of *Eng.* Symbolizing, *&c.* p. 24. to p. 37. p. 48.

All that I ſhall do therefore at preſent, is onely this, briefly to propound my Reaſons for the proof of my Aſſertion; by which I hope to make it evidently appear, that our Diſſenting Brethren lie under a great errour and miſtake, by thinking that all thoſe Rites and Ceremonies which are in themſelves indifferent, and of mans deviſing, ought to be utterly aboliſhed; and become ſinful for us to uſe, purely becauſe they either have been, or are notoriouſly abuſed to Idolatry. But here a few things muſt be premiſed, to prevent Cavils and Miſtakes.

See the Caſe of Indifferent Things.

(1) I take it for granted, that indifferent things may be lawfully uſed in the Worſhip of God. This is ſuppoſed in the preſent Queſtion; for otherwiſe it would

would be ſinful in us to kneel, whether that Geſture had been ever uſed or abuſed by Idolaters or no.

(2) I grant that the Worſhip of God is to be preſerved pure from all ſinful Mixtures and Defilements whatſoever, whether of Idolatry or Superſtition; and that things otherwiſe indifferent, which either in the deſigne of them that uſe them, or in their own preſent tendency, do directly promote or propagate ſuch Corruptions, do in that caſe become things unlawful. To follow Idolaters in what they think or do amiſs, to follow them generally in what they do, without other reaſon than onely the liking we have to the Pattern of their Example, which liking doth intimate a more univerſal approbation than is allowable; in theſe caſes I think, with the Reverend Mr. *Hooker*, Conformity with Idolaters is evil, and blame-worthy in any Chriſtian Church. See Dr. *Fal.* lib. Eccleſ. P. 443. *Hook.* Eccleſ. Pol. l. 4. p. 165.

But excepting theſe Caſes, it is not ſinful or blameworthy in any Society of Chriſtians to agree with Idolaters in Opinion or Practice, and to uſe the ſame Rites which they abuſe. And conſequently, our Church is not to be blamed or charged with Idolatry, for her Agreement with the Church of *Rome* in uſing the ſame Ceremonies, unleſs it can be proved that the Church of *England* doth abuſe the ſaid Ceremonies to ſinful ends; or that the Ceremonies uſed and appointed by our Church, naturally tend to promote the Corruptions practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, and were ill deſigned; or that ſhe did not follow the general Rules of Gods Word, the Directions of the Holy Ghoſt in appointing and enjoyning the uſe of Ceremonies, as being godly, comely, profitable; but overlooking all this, had an eye purely to the Example of Idolatrous Papiſts in what they did amiſs.

Now this I am ſure can never be made good againſt our

our Church, who hath ſufficiently vindicated her ſelf, by the open declarations ſhe hath printed to the World, from all accuſations of this nature. Let but any man conſult the *Articles of Religion*, the *Preface* to the book of Common Prayer juſt after the *Act of Uniformity*, the two excellent Diſcourſes that follow it *concerning the Service of the Church* and *Ceremonies*, and the Reaſons ſhe hath publiſht at the end of the Communion-ſervice for enjoyning her Communicants to receive Kneeling: I ſay, let any man peruſe theſe, and he will receive ample ſatisfaction, that our Governours in Church and State in appointing the uſe of Ceremonies did not ſteer by the Example of Idolaters, nor enjoyn them out of any ill deſigne, or to any ill ends; but were conducted by the *light* of *Gods Word*, the *Rules* of *Prudence* and *Charity*, the *Example* of the holy *Apoſtles*, and the *Practice* of pure *Antiquity*. Theſe things being premiſed, I proceed to prove this Aſſertion: *That it is not ſinful to uſe ſuch Things and Rites as either have been or are notoriouſly abuſed to Idolatry*: Or, which is all one, *That to kneel in the Act of Receiving according to the cuſtom of the Church of* England, *is not therefore ſinful, becauſe it hath been and is notoriouſly abuſed to Idolatry*, for theſe Reaſons.

Art. 20. Art. 34. Canon. 18.

(1) In general: No abuſe of any Geſture, though it be in the moſt manifeſt Idolatry, doth render that Geſture ſimply evil, and for ever after unlawful to be uſed in the Worſhip of God upon that account. For the abuſe of a thing ſuppoſes the lawful uſe of it; and if any thing otherwiſe lawful becomes ſinful by an abuſe of it, then it's plain that it is not in its own nature ſinful, but by accident, and with reſpect to ſomewhat elſe. This is clear from Scripture: for if Rites and Ceremonies, after they have been abuſed by Idolaters, become

become abſolutely evil and unlawful to be uſed at all, then the Jews ſinned in *offering Sacrifice*, erecting *Altars*, burning *Incenſe* to the God of Heaven, *bowing down* themſelves before him, wearing a *Linen Garment* in the time of divine Worſhip, and obſerving other Things and Rites which the Heathens obſerved in the Worſhip of their falſe Gods.

No (ſay the Diſſenters) we except all ſuch Rites as were commanded or approved of by God, and ſuch are all thoſe fore-mentioned. But, ſay I, it's a ſilly Exception, and avails nothing. For if the abuſe of a thing to Idolatry makes it abſolutely ſinful, and unlawful to be uſed at all, then it's impoſſible to deſtroy that Relation; and what hath been once abuſed, muſt ever remain ſo: that is, an infinite power can't undo what hath been done, and clear it from ever having been abuſed. And therefore I conclude from the Command and Approbation of God, that a bare Conformity with Idolaters in uſing thoſe Rites in the Worſhip of the true God, which they practiſe in the Worſhip of Idols, is not ſimply ſinful, or formal Idolatry; for if it had, God had obliged the Children of *Iſrael* by his expreſs Command to commit ſin, and to do what he ſtrictly and ſeverely prohibited in other places. In truth, ſuch a Poſition would plainly make God the Author of ſin.

(2) This Poſition, *That the Idolatrous abuſe of any thing, renders the uſe of it ſinful to all that know it*, is attended with very miſchievous conſequences and effects.

Firſt, It intrenches greatly upon Chriſtian liberty, as dear to our Diſſenting Brethren as the Apple of their Eyes: and I wonder they are not ſenſible of it. At other times they affirm that no earthly power can right-

ly

ly reſtrain the uſe of thoſe things which God hath left free and indifferent; and that thoſe things which otherwiſe are lawful, become ſinful when impoſed and enjoyned by lawful Authority: and yet theſe very men give that power to *Strangers*, both *Heathens* and *Papiſts*, which they take away from their own *rightful Princes* and *lawful Superiours*. An Idolater may yoke them, when a Proteſtant Prince muſt not touch them. And what more heavy and intolerable Yoke can be clapt on our necks than this, That another mans abuſe of any thing to Idolatry, though in its own nature indifferent, and left free by God, renders the uſe of it ſinful? Whether this be not a violation of Chriſtian Liberty, let St. *Paul* determine; who tells us, that *to the pure all things are pure*; and affirms it lawful to eat of
1 Cor. 10. 25, 27, 28, 29. ſuch things as had been offered to Idols, and *to eat whatſoever was ſold in the ſhambles*. And what reaſon is there why a Geſture ſhould be more defiled by Idolaters, than Meat which they had offered up in Sacrifice to Idols? and why ſhould one be ſinful and idolatrous to uſe, and not the other? Certainly St. *Paul* would never have granted them ſuch a priviledge, if he judged it idolatrous to uſe what Idolaters had abuſed; eſpecially conſidering that he in the ſame Chapter exhorts them
Verſ. 14. earneſtly to *flee from Idolatry*.

Secondly, This Poſition ſubjects the minds of Chriſtians to infinite Scruples and Perplexities, and naturally tends to reduce us to ſuch a ſtate and condition in which both the Jews and Gentiles were, before the glorious light of the Goſpel broke out upon the World: that is, it tends to beget and propagate a baſe ſervile temper and diſpoſition towards God, and to fill us with fears and tremblings when we are engaged in his Worſhip and Service. Whereas the true and great deſigne of the

the Goſpel, is to breed in men a filial cheerful frame of heart, the *ſpirit of Love, and of a ſound* or quiet *mind*; to give us a free, eaſie, comfortable acceſs to God as to our Father, and to encourage every good man to a diligent, conſtant, frequent attendance upon the duties of his Worſhip, by the pleaſure and delight that follows them. But now if nothing may be uſed by us without highly offending God, that either hath been or is abuſed to Idolatry; who ſees not what trouble and diſtraction will ariſe in our minds hereupon, when we meet together to worſhip God? It's well known that moſt of our *Churches* were erected by *Idolatrous Papiſts*, and as much defiled by Idolatry as any Geſture can be; they are dedicated to ſeveral *Saints* and *Angels*, whoſe Images were once ſet up and adored. Our *Bells*, *Pews*, *Fonts*, *Desks*, *Church-yards*, have been conſecrated after a ſuperſtitious manner; many *Cups*, *Flagons*, *Diſhes*, *Communion-Tables*, have been given and uſed by Idolaters. What now is to be done? If Kneeling at the Sacrament be ſinful, becauſe it hath been abuſed by Idolaters notoriouſly; ſo alſo it is ſinful to uſe any other Thing or Rite that hath, if it be of mans deviſing, as the fore-mentioned Writers limit the Queſtion. If Sitting were allowed by Authority, we could not come to the publick Churches, nor to the Sacrament, nor chriſten our Children for all that, if we know the Font and other Utenſils of the Church were once abuſed to Idolatry by Papiſts: We muſt firſt make a diligent ſearch, and if certain information cannot be had, we can't worſhip God in publick without panick fears and great diſquiet of mind.

Rom. 8. 15. 2 Tim. 1. 7.

But *thirdly*, Such a Poſition as this will deſtroy all Publick Worſhip. For if nothing muſt be uſed which hath been or is abuſed by Idolaters, it will be in the

power of Idolaters, by ingroſſing all the outward marks and ſignes of that inward veneration and eſteem which we owe to God, to ſmother our Devotions, ſo as they ſhall never appear in the World; and by that means fruſtrate the very end and deſigne of Religious Aſſemblies. And truly this Work is already, by the ſtrength of this Principle, very well effected. For *Kneeling* at Prayers, and *ſtanding* and *ſitting*, and lifting up the hands and eyes to Heaven, and bowing of the body, together with Prayer and Praiſe, and Singing, have been all notoriouſly abuſed to Idolatry, and are ſo at this day.

Object. I know how it will be replied, that they except ſuch things as are neceſſary to be uſed in the Service of God; it's abſolutely neceſſary that we worſhip God, and do him publick Honour; and whatſoever is neceſſary in order to this, may lawfully be uſed by us without ſin, though the ſame geſtures and ſignes of Adoration are uſed and abuſed by Idolaters.

Anſw. To this I anſwer, That this is cunningly, but not honeſtly and truly ſaid. For the Reaſons they give to prove that it is ſinful to uſe the ſame Rites and Ceremonies with Idolaters at any time, prove it ſo at all times, and make it for ever ſo. So long as the Reaſons hold to make any thing ſinful, ſo long it is ſo. If the uſe or abuſe of any thing by Idolaters make it ſimply evil, then it muſt for ever remain ſo; and no neceſſity whatſoever can take it off, and make it lawful and innocent. If ſuch Things and Ceremonies which are or have been abuſed to Idolatry, become ſinful in theſe by-reſpects, and for theſe reaſons, *viz.* *Becauſe they put us in mind of Idolatry, and preſerve the memory of Idols*; and ſecondly, *Becauſe they move us to turn back to Idolatry, and ſort us with Idolaters*: then it will be ever ſinful

See *Gilleſp.* p. 128. 1. Reductive, 2. Participative: *Quia Monent, Quia Movent.* 134. 149.

ſinful for us to uſe them. For theſe Reaſons will hold good in things that are of neceſſary uſe in the Church, as well as in things that are not neceſſary: that is, nothing can hinder and deſtroy theſe effects; they will ever mind us of, and move us to Idolatry. And from hence I conclude that this Principle is a very falſe one, and ought to be laid aſide. For it is attended with this abſurdity: It obliges us utterly to aboliſh, and forbids the uſe of all ſuch Rites as have been notoriouſly abuſed to Idolatry in ſome caſes, for reaſons which eternally hold in all. So that at laſt it drives us into ſuch ſtreights, that we muſt ſin one way or other. For either we muſt not worſhip God in publick, or we muſt be guilty of *Idolatry* if we do: And though of two Evils or Calamities the leaſt is to be choſen, yet of two Sins neither is. Chriſtian Religion flows from infinite Wiſdom; and the Laws of God do not croſs one another, but are even and conſiſtent. We are never caſt by God under a neceſſity of ſinning, of tranſgreſſing one Law by the obſervance of another; but thus it muſt be, if we take up and ſtick to this Principle. *Gilleſp. c. 3. p. 149.*

(3) Our Diſſenting Brethren condemn themſelves in what they allow and practiſe, by the ſame Rule by which they condemn Kneeling at the Sacrament, and other Rites of our Church. For they themſelves did uſe, without Scruple, ſuch *Places* and *Things* and *Poſtures* as had been defiled and abuſed by *Idolaters*. They were wont to be bare-headed in time of divine Worſhip, at Prayer, and at the Sacrament; and ſo do Idolatrous Papiſts: they never affirmed that it was ſinful to kneel at our Prayers both publick and private; yet this Geſture the Papiſts uſe in their Prayers to the *Virgin Mary*, to the *Croſs*, to *Saints* and *Angels*. They uſed our Churches, Church-yards, and Bells, and never

thought they ſin'd againſt God by ſo doing, though they knew they had been abuſed. Nay, the *Directory* declares, *That ſuch places are not ſubject to any ſuch Pollution by any Superſtition formerly uſed and now laid aſide, as may render them unlawful and inconvenient.* Mr. *Rutherford* ſaith of Bells groſly abuſed in time of Popery, *That it is unreaſonable and groundleſs, that thereupon they ſhould be diſuſed.* Upon which the Reverend Dr. *Faulkner* hath this judicious Remark: The pretence of their convenient uſefulneſs would be no better Excuſe on their behalf, than was that Plea for ſparing the beſt of the *Amalekites* Cattel that they might be a Sacrifice, when God had devoted them to Deſtruction. For if God (as they ſay) hath commanded that all ſuch Things and Rites ſhould be utterly aboliſhed as were of mans deviſing, and had been abuſed to Idolatry; then the convenient uſefulneſs of ſuch Places and Things will never bear them out.

Direct. of the day and place of Worſhip.

Rutherf. of Scandal, Q. 5, 6.

(4) If it be ſinful to kneel at the Sacrament becauſe that Geſture hath been and is notoriouſly abuſed by Papiſts to idolatrous ends, ſo alſo is Sitting, which is contended for with ſo much ſhew of Zeal. For the Pope himſelf ſits in the Act of Receiving, as was before noted; and (if any credit be to be given to a Doctor of the Church of *Rome*) for the ſame reaſon which our Diſſenters urge for Sitting, *viz.* becauſe the Apoſtles ſate at the firſt Inſtitution and Celebration of the Sacrament. *If any enquire why the Pope Receives Sitting, it may be replied, that he uſeth that Geſture in remembrance of St.* Peter *and the other Apoſtles, who Received the Body of our Lord at the laſt Supper Sitting.*

Si quæratur quare Dominus Papa Sedendo Communicat, poteſt dici, quod hoc ſit in recordationem, quod Beatus Petrus & alli Apoſtoli ſedendo Corpus Domini in Cœna ultima acceperunt. *Alex. Hales*, Tract de Miſſa, *par.* 2. *Queſt.* 10. *par.* 4.

To conclude; If Kneeling be unlawful becauſe it hath

hath been abuſed to Idolatry, then we muſt never Receive the Holy Sacrament. For we muſt Receive in ſome convenient Poſture, ſuch as *Kneeling*, *Sitting*, *Diſcumbing*, *Standing*; and yet every one of theſe either have been or is notoriouſly abuſed by Heathens and Papiſts to Idolatrous ends.

I have now finiſht what I undertook; and endeavoured, all that in me lies, to ſatisfie all honeſt and peaceable Diſſenters that they may lawfully and innocently Kneel in the Act of Receiving the Holy Sacrament. What Succeſs this Diſcourſe will have, I know not; but this I am ſure of, it is well meant; and if it be *read* with the ſame *Charity* as it was *written*, with an *honeſt teachable mind*, a mind not pleaſed with its Scruples, I hope by Gods bleſſing it will do ſome good in the World. And really if any of our Diſſenting Brethren ſhall Receive thus much ſatisfaction from what I have written, That by Kneeling in the Act of Receiving they tranſgreſs no known *Law of God*, nor act contrary to our bleſſed Saviour's *Example*; That they do nothing but what becomes them, and is very ſutable to the *nature* of the *Lords Supper*, nothing but what is agreeable to the *practice* of the *univerſal Church* in the firſt and pureſt Ages; I don't ſee what other Scruples about Kneeling ſhould block up their way to the Lords Table, and hinder them from communicating with us. There are a ſort of men, I confeſs, who ſeparate from our Church, upon whom I deſpair of doing good by any attempts of this nature; and they are ſuch whoſe Scruples ariſe from a vitious Principle, not from the *weakneſs* of their underſtandings, but the *obſtinacy* of their wills; not from a great fear of offending God which keeps pace with all their actions (for ſuch

I have as tender a compaſſion as any man) but from *Humour, Self-Conceit, Affectation of popular Applauſe*, and the being thought the wiſer and better men, for finding fault with every thing enjoyned by lawful Authority, and every thing that is written in defence of it: Nor upon men whoſe Scruples againſt *Government by Biſhops*, the *Liturgie* and *Rites* of the *Church*, ariſe, not from their *Conſciences* but their *Stomachs*, from *Pride* and *Ambition*, from private *piques* and *diſappointments* in the *State*, from *Hypocriſie* and *Intereſt*, when the more they rail and except againſt Ceremonies, the better Trade they drive in the World: From ſuch as theſe I expect nothing but Contempt and Deriſion, and that the Medicine will be turned into Poyſon. For as a great man obſerves on *Prov.* 14.6. *He that comes to ſeek after Knowledge with a mind to ſcorn and cenſure, ſhall be ſure to find matter enough for his Humour, but no matter for his Inſtruction.*

Lord *Bacon* Advan. of Learn. fol. p. 230.

FINIS.

For

For Kneeling, I never yet heard any thing to prove it unlawful. If there be any thing, it must be either ſome Word of God, or the nature of the Ordinance which is ſuppoſed to be contradicted. But (1) there is no Word of God for any Geſture, nor againſt any. Chriſt's Example can never be proved to oblige us more in this than in many other circumſtances, that are confeſſed not obligatory. As, that he delivered but to Miniſters, and but to a Family, to Twelve, and after Supper, and on a Thurſday-night, and in an upper Room, &c. and his Geſture was not ſuch a Sitting as ours. And (2) for the nature of the Ordinance, it is mixt: and if it be lawful to take a Pardon from the King upon our Knees, I know not what can make it unlawful to take a ſealed Pardon from Chriſt (by his Embaſſadour) upon our Knees.

Mr. *Baxter's* Chriſtian Directory,
par. 2. p. 111. Queſt. 3. § 40.